

By MARSHALL E. SCHWARTZ
Members of the April Third Movement walked out of the long-awaited and much-maligned Trustees' hearing on the future of the Stanford Research Institute (SRI) yesterday in the Meyer Library forum room as a full house watched the proceedings in Memorial Auditorium.

The walkout, accompanied by a similar exodus at Mem Aud, came after law student Doron Weinberg, the last scheduled student speaker, demanded that the trustees say what standards they would use in deciding on the SRI issue.

Following the ground rules of the hearing, which the Board drew up and repeatedly refused to change, the trustees refused to answer Weinberg's question.

Those who left the hearing joined others from Mem Aud for a meeting outside of the auditorium to discuss tactics.

Weinberg had declared that the idea of a restrictive covenant in selling SRI "is fatuous—it's a joke, it's a bribe, and even a hoax."

"A university has no business making money," he told the trustees. "A university should be struggling. I don't think you understand that."

Fifteen students, five faculty members, and four SRI administrators addressed the panel of five trustees: Morris M. Doyle, Richard E. Guggenbime, William R. Hewlett, Mrs. Ailsa E. Charles, and Dean A. Watkins.

The SRI administrators were first to speak, and devoted most of their hour to describing many of the institute's projects they consider beneficial, such as urban transportation, laser surgery, and organ transplants.

Also discussed was the importance of

SRI and the feeling of its staff.
"The organization is so complex and so interdependent that one cannot talk of snipping off a segment here or there without seriously impairing the entire institute," Charles Anderson, president of SRI, said in his opening remarks.

"A mechanism of this complexity and delicacy cannot stand much outside tinkering... After hearing the diversity of the work possible in this kind of organization, you might agree with me that if SRI did not exist today, there would be strong pressure to create it."

Later, Anderson added, "The men and women of SRI are dedicated scientists and professionals, active and socially constructive members of the community. They have been terribly maligned in the past few weeks..."

"The staff of SRI is hurt and dismayed, and I share their sense of frustration... A great many of our scientific and professional staff members will not work under outside restraints. Obviously, the departure of any significant number of these research personnel would mean the virtual death of SRI," he said.

Wide Spectrum

Both sides of the question were presented by the group of students, as representatives of organizations covering the entire political spectrum—from SDS, the Resistance, and the Third World Liberation Front to the Young Republicans and Young Americans for Freedom—spoke at the meeting.

Before the scheduled speakers addressed the hearing, Joan Woolen, graduate business student, read a statement for the ASSU Nominations Committee, expressing the group's "dismay at having to select such a small group" and said that "all future meetings of this sort must be

completely open."
Most of the students supported the April Third Movement's demands. "There is very clearly a conflict of interest between the Board of Trustees and the students on this issue," commented Paul Rupert, a member of the Resistance and United Campus Ministry.

"It is my hope we can resolve this conflict peacefully. But the reason we disagree is that we have very great conflicts in world view... The role of the University should be a critical role. We should not have SRI and the University aiding military policy. The question of counterinsurgency is a clear matter of urgency to us."

Additional Demands

Two members of the Third World Liberation Front, David Edwards and Neal Okabayashi, blasted the Trustees and made ten demands on them.

"We are here to confront you," Okabayashi said. "It is you and people like you who have set the scene for the barbaric and inhumane scene in the Third World today. We point an accusing finger at you."

"A lot of people in this room base their argument on moralism," Edwards noted. "I just cannot see any morality in the richest nation in the world, probably the greatest nation that has ever come into this world, using almost all its resources to kill people in North Vietnam."

The demands they presented included stopping all counterinsurgency and chemical-biological warfare research presently being conducted at SRI, closing down SRI counterinsurgency operations in Thailand, ending SRI work in electronic warfare, closing the international branch of SRI, bringing SRI under closer control of the

University, and establishing a board to review SRI research which would include a significant number of Third World people.

Other Side

On the other side was YAF President Harvey Hukari. "The attack on SRI is not merely an attack on the institute itself but on capitalism, Stanford University, U.S. foreign policy, and the Board of Trustees itself," he said.

"To speak in favor of CBW and counterinsurgency research is to place yourself in a position of being called a heretic, even immoral," Hukari added. "But I believe CBW work is important and vital."

"Any restriction which stops the free pursuit of knowledge is inherently immoral. Researchers have the right to determine whether or not their work is immoral."

Students Stage Walkout At

Trustee Hearing In UGLY